

Lungren, Daniel E.	Olson Paul	Shock Sensenbrenner	Cassidy Castle	Heller Hensarling	Meeks (NY) Melancon	Shuster Simpson	Teague Terry	Wasserman Schultz
Mack	Paulsen	Sessions	Castor (FL)	Herger	Mica	Sires	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Manzullo	Pence	Shadegg	Chaffetz	Hersteth Sandlin	Michaud	Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Watson
Marchant	Petri	Shimkus	Chandler	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Slaughter	Thompson (PA)	Watt
Markey (CO)	Pitts	Shuler	Childers	Hill	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Thornberry	Waxman
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Shuster	Chu	Himes	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Tiberi	Weiner
McCaul	Poe (TX)	Simpson	Clarke	Hinchee	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Tierney	Welch
McClintock	Posey	Smith (NE)	Clay	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Titus	Westmoreland
McCotter	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Cleaver	Hirono	Minnick	Space	Tonko	Whitfield
McHenry	Putnam	Smith (TX)	Clyburn	Holden	Mitchell	Speier	Towns	Wilson (OH)
McKeon	Radanovich	Stearns	Coble	Holt	Mollohan	Spratt	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Rehberg	Sullivan	Coffman (CO)	Honda	Moore (KS)	Stark	Turner	Wittman
Rodgers	Reichert	Terry	Cohen	Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Stearns	Upton	Wolf
Mica	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Cole	Hunter	Moran (WI)	Stupak	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Conaway	Inglis	Moran (KS)	Sullivan	Velázquez	Wu
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi	Connolly (VA)	Insee	Moran (VA)	Sutton	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Turner	Conyers	Israel	Murphy (CT)	Tanner	Walden	Young (AK)
Minnick	Rohrabacher	Upton	Cooper	Issa	Murphy (NY)	Taylor	Walz	
Mitchell	Rooney	Walden	Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim			
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland	Costello	Jackson (IL)	Myrick			
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Whitfield	Costello	Jackson Lee	Nadler (NY)			
Myrick	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Courtney	(TX)	Napolitano			
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wittman	Crenshaw	Jenkins	Neal (MA)			
Nunes	Scalise	Wolf	Critz	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer			
Nye	Schmidt	Young (AK)	Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Nunes			
			Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Nye			
			Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Oberstar			
			Cummings	Jones	Obey			
			Dahlkemper	Jordan (OH)	Olson			
			Davis (AL)	Kagen	Olver			
			Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Owens			
			Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Pallone			
			Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Pascarell			
			Davis (TN)	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)			
			DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Paulsen			
			DeGette	Kilroy	Payne			
			DeLauro	King (IA)	Pence			
			Dent	Kingston	Perlmutter			
			Deutch	Kirk	Perriello			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kissell	Peterson			
			Dicks	Klein (FL)	Petri			
			Dingell	Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME)			
			Djou	Kosmas	Pitts			
			Doggett	Kratovil	Platts			
			Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich	Poe (TX)			
			Dreier	Lamborn	Polis (CO)			
			Driehaus	Lance	Pomeroy			
			Duncan	Langevin	Posey			
			Edwards (MD)	Larsen (WA)	Price (GA)			
			Edwards (TX)	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)			
			Ehlers	Latham	Putnam			
			Ellison	LaTourette	Radanovich			
			Ellsworth	Latta	Rahall			
			Emerson	Lee (CA)	Rangel			
			Engel	Lee (NY)	Rehberg			
			Eshoo	Levin	Reichert			
			Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Reyes			
			Farr	Lewis (GA)	Richardson			
			Fattah	Linder	Rodriguez			
			Filner	Lipinski	Roe (TN)			
			Fleming	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)			
			Forbes	Loebbeck	Rogers (KY)			
			Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)			
			Foster	Lowey	Rohrabacher			
			Fox	Lucas	Rooney			
			Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Franks (AZ)	Luján	Roskam			
			Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Ross			
			Fudge	Lungren, Daniel E.	Rothman (NJ)			
			Galleghy	Lynch	Roybal-Allard			
			Garamendi	Mack	Royce			
			Garrett (NJ)	Maffei	Ruppersberger			
			Gerlach	Maloney	Ryan (OH)			
			Giffords	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)			
			Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Salazar			
			Gohmert	Markey (CA)	Sánchez, Linda T.			
			Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta			
			Goodlatte	Marshall	Sarbanes			
			Gordon (TN)	Matheson	Scalise			
			Granger	Matsui	Schakowsky			
			Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	Schauer			
			Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff			
			Green, Al	McCaul	Schmidt			
			Green, Gene	McClintock	Schock			
			Griffith	McCollum	Schrader			
			Grijalva	McCotter	Schwartz			
			Guthrie	McDermott	Scott (GA)			
			Gutierrez	McGovern	Scott (VA)			
			Hall (NY)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner			
			Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Serrano			
			Halvorson	McKeon	Sessions			
			Hare	McMahon	Sestak			
			Harman	McMorris	Shadegg			
			Harper	McNerney	Shea-Porter			
			Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherman			
			Hastings (WA)		Shimkus			
			Heinrich		Shuler			

## NOT VOTING—15

Cantor	Hoekstra	Quigley
Capuano	King (NY)	Tiahrt
Doyle	Maloney	Titus
Fallin	Murphy, Patrick	Wamp
Hodes	Ortiz	Young (FL)

□ 1200

Messrs. HELLER, CARTER, and BAIRD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 4, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	Berry	Bright
Aderholt	Biggart	Brown (SC)
Adler (NJ)	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Akin	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Arcuri	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Austria	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Baca	Blunt	Buyer
Bachmann	Boccieri	Calvert
Bachus	Boehner	Camp
Baird	Bonner	Campbell
Baldwin	Bono Mack	Cantor
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Cao
Barrow	Boren	Capito
Bartlett	Boswell	Capps
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Cardoza
Bean	Boustany	Carnahan
Becerra	Boyd	Carney
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Berman	Braley (IA)	Carter

NAYS—4

Broun (GA)	Graves (GA)
Flake	Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rush
Capuano	King (NY)	Snyder
Doyle	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Fallin	Ortiz	Wamp
Hodes	Quigley	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1212

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5720

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 5720.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

## UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1550, I call up the bill (H.R. 4213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and I have a motion at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010”.*

## SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) by striking “June 2, 2010” each place it appears and inserting “November 30, 2010”;

(B) in the heading for subsection (b)(2), by striking “JUNE 2, 2010” and inserting “NOVEMBER 30, 2010”; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2011”.

(2) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 444), is amended—

(A) by striking “June 2, 2010” each place it appears and inserting “December 1, 2010”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “May 1, 2011”.

(3) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “November 6, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2011”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010; and”.

(c) CONDITIONS FOR RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 4001(d)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before “shall apply” the following: “(including terms and conditions relating to availability for work, active search for work, and refusal to accept work)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Continuing Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-157).

### SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.

(a) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT INELIGIBLE BY REASON OF NEW ENTITLEMENT TO REGULAR BENEFITS.—Section 4002 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.—

“(1) If—

“(A) an individual has been determined to be entitled to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to a benefit year,

“(B) that benefit year has expired,

“(C) that individual has remaining entitlement to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to that benefit year, and

“(D) that individual would qualify for a new benefit year in which the weekly benefit amount of regular compensation is at least either \$100 or 25 percent less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount in the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A),

then the State shall determine eligibility for compensation as provided in paragraph (2).

“(2) For individuals described in paragraph (1), the State shall determine whether the individual is to be paid emergency unemployment compensation or regular compensation for a week of unemployment using one of the following methods:

“(A) The State shall, if permitted by State law, establish a new benefit year, but defer the payment of regular compensation with respect to that new benefit year until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

“(B) The State shall, if permitted by State law, defer the establishment of a new benefit year (which uses all the wages and employment

which would have been used to establish a benefit year but for the application of this paragraph), until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

“(C) The State shall pay, if permitted by State law—

“(i) regular compensation equal to the weekly benefit amount established under the new benefit year, and

“(ii) emergency unemployment compensation equal to the difference between that weekly benefit amount and the weekly benefit amount for the expired benefit year; or

“(D) The State shall determine rights to emergency unemployment compensation without regard to any rights to regular compensation if the individual elects to not file a claim for regular compensation under the new benefit year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to individuals whose benefit years, as described in section 4002(g)(1)(B) the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note), as amended by this section, expire after the date of enactment of this Act.

### SEC. 4. REQUIRING STATES TO NOT REDUCE REGULAR COMPENSATION IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS UNDER THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

Section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) NONREDUCTION RULE.—An agreement under this section shall not apply (or shall cease to apply) with respect to a State upon a determination by the Secretary that the method governing the computation of regular compensation under the State law of that State has been modified in a manner such that—

“(1) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which will be payable during the period of the agreement occurring on or after June 2, 2010 (determined disregarding any additional amounts attributable to the modification described in section 2002(b)(1) of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 438)), will be less than

“(2) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which would otherwise have been payable during such period under the State law, as in effect on June 2, 2010.”.

### SEC. 5. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ‘Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation’ for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on this conference report or amendment between the Houses.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—Sections 2 and 3—

(1) are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill H.R. 4213 contains an emergency designation for the purposes of pay-as-you-go principles under clause 10(c) of rule XXI; and an emergency designation pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

Accordingly, the Chair must put the question of the consideration under clause 10(c)(3) of rule XXI and under section 4(g)(2) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The question is, Will the House now consider the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1550, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this action should have occurred 2 months ago. This House acted to extend unemployment insurance on May 28. For 6 weeks Republicans in the Senate blocked unemployment insurance. They stood not on the side but in the way of millions of Americans. During those 6 weeks, over 2.5 million unemployed Americans exhausted their benefits, and they struggled to stay afloat while continuing to look for work in this difficult economy.

Americans like this person from Grand Rapids, Michigan, who wrote me, and I quote, “I worked 22 years in automotive, 60 to 70 hours a week, supported my family, paid my taxes, and worked in my community. Every single day I send my resume out, to no avail. I have lost my home, one vehicle, and my sense of the ability to take care of my family.”

Or this individual from Madison Heights, Michigan. “My family is not living large; we are surviving. Cutting unemployment insurance will take us out of survival mode and put us into homeless mode. After working 20-plus years, this is the first time that we have asked for unemployment.”

And to add insult to injury, after their filibuster was broken, Senate Republicans insisted on running out the clock and delaying the full 30 hours before they would let a final vote occur in the other body. Thirty hours for nothing. No excuse of theirs worked for working Americans out of work, out of work through no fault of their own and looking for work.

We have acted to extend unemployment insurance in Republican Congresses under Republican Presidents. So today we put this sad chapter behind us, and now we move forward to continue our efforts to support job creation and to continue to dig out of the jobs ditch inherited by this administration and by this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Louisiana has faced four hurricanes, a recession, and now an oil spill. And every one of us in this body has faced and looked into the eyes of those who lost their homes and lost their jobs. And every one of us in this body feels deep compassion for those who are in those dire straits. And we all want to help. Republicans want to help those looking for work, we want to help those who are struggling with this current economic slowdown, but we also agree with the American people that new spending must be paid for.

□ 1220

This latest unemployment insurance extender bill fails to do what the American people want us to do. Instead, the Democratic approach adds another \$34 billion to the already staggering \$13 trillion national debt. And that's not because we have a shortage of ineffective, inefficient, wasteful spending that we could cut to offset what's needed to pay for this. We want to do this, but we want to do what the American people want us to do—and that is to pay for it.

Republicans have repeatedly called for the cutting of unspent stimulus spending to offset this new stream of spending. The majority leader himself, Mr. HOYER, said on June 13, there is "spending fatigue" across this country and that "if we have dollars not yet expended in the recovery act" that they should be redirected for new spending such as this.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago the administration told the American people that their trillion-dollar stimulus plan would create millions of jobs and keep unemployment below 8 percent. Instead, 2 million jobs more have been lost and unemployment surged to nearly 10 percent. Overall, 47 out of 50 States have lost jobs since the Democrats' February 2009 stimulus bill, including my home State of Louisiana.

Instead of supporting this economy and getting Americans back to work, jobs have been lost, our debt continues to spiral out of control, and the only solution we have here, without an ability to amend, without an ability to offer some alternative approach, is to add another \$34 billion in new spending without offsetting it. New spending is unnecessary, and Republicans have been calling for this wasted stimulus money to be put to better use by supporting the long-term unemployed. I suggest the best way to create jobs is to stop destroying good-paying jobs that already exist. And let me explain what I mean by that.

This is the single most important issue in my home State of Louisiana. The people of Louisiana are facing job loss. In addition to a failed economic policy, a failed stimulus, President Obama's ill-conceived and unwarranted and—in the words of a Federal judge—arbitrary and capricious ban on offshore drilling is galvanizing residents across the gulf coast like I've never seen before. And the long term implications of this, Mr. Speaker, are real. Real lives are affected by this.

Because of this policy, tens of thousands of good-paying jobs along the gulf coast are immediately at risk, and it doesn't have to be this way. But unfortunately, the elites in this administration and the President himself refuse to understand this.

Six weeks ago, the Louisiana delegation—the entire delegation, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate—requested a meeting with the President in writing. And we have not even gotten a response back. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that's just unacceptable, and it's irresponsible.

Already three gulf rigs have left American waters heading to other parts of the world, and the trend is going to continue at an accelerated rate. And once a rig is gone, it could be years before it returns—if it ever returns at all. Each one of these deep-water rigs employs 1,400 workers. You take 1,400 workers and multiply it by six, and those are the immediate support workers. These are jobs that are being lost.

And smaller companies that cannot afford to move are simply losing their workers. People are losing their jobs, costing thousands of jobs.

I met recently with about 35 companies. These are all small companies affected by this. And there was an African American couple. He got started doing janitorial work. And he worked very hard for years to do this, saved his money and started a small business, an oil service company that he was so proud of. The American dream, by God. He started this company and grew it to 20 workers. And he had accelerating work until this ban on drilling, and now he has no work, and he's seeing his life savings go down the drain. Why? Because of an ill-founded, government-imposed moratorium that makes no sense.

These are rig workers and energy engineers, they're plumbers, they're electricians, they're dock workers. They work in the maritime industry. And yet this is the kind of policy we're getting. This ban hurts everybody. We stand united on the gulf coast to support good-paying jobs.

This stimulus has failed, and it's time to direct these funds into more beneficial areas to help those who are chronically unemployed.

The last time this House acted, Mr. CAMP, the ranking member of our Ways and Means Committee, offered a motion to extend these benefits while paying for the spending by using unspent

funds from the failed stimulus bill. The House could immediately act on that same type of provision today with the Senate following suit to get these benefits to the long-term unemployed in a way that helps the economy, job creation—instead of hampering job creation even more.

That is what we should be doing and what would most help the unemployed get benefits that they need today and the jobs that they need tomorrow.

The American people want President Obama and this Congress to spur entrepreneurship and American competitiveness and to create good-paying jobs. Instead, the President and this Congress continue on a path of increasing uncertainty leading to high unemployment and runaway spending. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my very distinct pleasure and privilege to yield 1 minute to the most distinguished Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing this important legislation to the floor today. And indeed, there is some good news in it, but there is some not-so-good news in it as well.

I listened very attentively to the previous speaker talk about why these unemployment benefits had to be paid for, and I was struck by the inconsistency in his remarks and that of the Republicans in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives. It's important to note that while they demand that these benefits be paid for—\$34 billion in unemployment benefits going to those who have played by the rules, worked hard, who are unemployed through no fault of their own, \$34 billion, which injected into the economy will indeed create jobs—while they have said that \$700 billion of tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America shouldn't be paid for. "Inconsistent" is the politest word I can use to describe that.

Thirty-four billion dollars for those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

Last week the Economic Policy Institute released a report making it clear that not only do unemployment benefits protect those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, but would lead to more jobs, higher wages, and a stronger economy for all Americans.

And why is that so? That is so because these benefits are given to people who need them. The money will be spent immediately on necessities injecting demand into the economy, creating jobs. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute figured that would be 1.4 million jobs relating to the unemployment benefits that are out there now.

The Congressional Budget Office which is independent and nonpartisan has confirmed that extending unemployment benefits is the most efficient way for the government to generate economic growth.

Now, I know why the gentleman may want to change the subject to other things. He mentions Katrina. We all supported Katrina. Did anybody talk about paying for that emergency? No. It was an emergency. We have a compact with the American people in the time of a natural disaster—even though that disaster was exacerbated by cronyism in the Bush administration.

But let's not go there. Let's just stay on this subject. And the subject at hand is when this bill was introduced today, this resolution, I'm sure you all heard that it was an amendment to an amendment. Well, the Senate amendment that we are voting on, the amendment that they put in took out the jobs initiatives. And those initiatives were paid for. Build America Bonds. That was part of the original bill, to build the infrastructure of America, the highways and infrastructure of America in a new green way creating new green jobs and new green technologies. And the Build America jobs that went beyond those investments; FMAP to stabilize our State economies.

Thirty States have written their budgets already on the basis of this funding being in the legislation and paid for—not increasing the deficit. We passed it in December. The Senate only now is sending it back to us because the Republicans have objected to that, and the amendment to the amendment eliminates that stability for States.

□ 1230

Summer jobs, well, it's too late for summer jobs, so youth jobs. In December, we passed the bill for summer jobs for America's youth. The amendment to the amendment takes out those youths. And they were paid for, because on the one hand they say everything has to be paid for. Well, when it's paid for, then are they just plain opposed to summer jobs for youths? Are they opposed to Build America Bonds to grow our economy and meet the needs of our country infrastructure-wise?

The Housing Trust Fund, very, very important initiative.

Concurrent receipt: I don't think there's any doubt that every person in this Congress supports our veterans. One issue that is a high priority for America's veterans when we meet with them on a regular basis is the issue of concurrent receipt. You may not be familiar with that term, but it's a disability tax on our veterans, and with so many veterans returning home with disabilities from Iraq and Afghanistan this is very, very important. It was in the bill. It was paid for. Again, money given to people who need it for necessities who would spend it, inject demand into the economy and create jobs. So the amendment to the amendment that the Senate Republicans would finally let pass in the Senate removed concurrent receipt, paid for, for our veterans.

The list goes on and on, a list of paid-for initiatives that benefit our veterans, grow our economy, create jobs, help our workers, help our young people, stabilize our States, all paid for. The Republican Senators said "no," and they held up this particular amendment to the amendment for over 6 weeks because they said it had to be paid for.

At the very same time, they were saying we must pay for \$34 billion for benefits for the unemployed but we don't have to pay for the \$700 billion for the wealthiest people in America to have tax cuts. Those same tax cuts, during the 8 years of the Bush administration, did not create jobs; they increased the deficit. And the Republicans have said they want to go back to the exact agenda of the Bush administration. They look with increased fondness on the Bush administration.

Well, let me say this here today. The good news about this is finally our unemployed will get their benefits. It will be retroactive. It's really sad that it has to come to this. Nonpaid-for tax cuts for the rich; paid-for benefits for our workers.

But it's important to note, contrary to what you might hear from some in this Chamber, that in the first 8 months of the Obama administration, more jobs were created—well, by the time we finish August, more jobs will have been created than in the 8 years of the Bush administration. While they increased the deficit by trillions of dollars, while we lost jobs, where they took us to a brink of financial crisis of our financial industry, where they took us deep into recession, where they took us deep into deficit, they want to return to the exact same agenda.

We are not going back and our step forward into the future, one step into the future is being taken today when we say to American workers, You have played by the rules. You have worked hard. You have lost your job through no fault of your own. You have these benefits, but we must do more to create jobs, to create more jobs.

I urge our colleagues today to understand how important this is, the distinction between those who support our workers. Respect the contract that we have with them so that when the economy ebbs and flows and the cycle of employment and unemployment is not in their favor, that we will be there for them. And being there for them is not just about them. It's also about the entire economy, the entire economy. The economy cannot flourish and be entrepreneurial unless it knows that there's a safety net in case the economy comes down.

The Republicans are saying "no" to that. They've said "no" over and over again, and they're saying "no" today unless it is paid for, again, while they still say, We want tax cuts for the wealthiest, \$700 billion worth, 20 times more than this bill for unemployment insurance.

But don't forget what they took out of the bill and don't forget that that

includes concurrent receipt for our veterans.

I urge our colleagues to proudly vote for this legislation.

I commend my colleague Mr. LEVIN for his hard work on this and other legislation, and I know, because it's absolutely essential, that at some point we will get a jobs bill that will come back from the Senate. We agree that it should be paid for. We've sent it over to them paid for, and that they will recognize that we need to create jobs, good-paying jobs that take us into the future and, most of all, that we're not going back to the failed economic policies of the Bush administration.

I urge a strong "aye" vote on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth time this unemployment benefit insurance is extended. I think that, in and of itself, speaks for the failure of the economic policies.

Secondly, a massive tax increase in the face of economic uncertainty is only going to hurt economic growth and job creation, and on our side of the aisle, we'll work to find the offset to avoiding these tax increases on the American people.

And finally, I just want to point out that private sector growth in the year 2010, the rate of private sector growth has actually been slower than what we saw in the Great Depression.

I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), the ranking member on one of the subcommittees of Ways and Means.

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider legislation paying another \$34 billion in unemployment benefits. The other side says that these unemployment benefits stretching to almost 2 years are needed and must be added to the \$13 trillion debt, even as they claim their trillion dollar stimulus plan has been a success at creating millions of jobs. It makes you wonder if they are looking at the same jobs data as the rest of us.

Eighteen months ago, this administration said the stimulus would create 3.7 million jobs. It hasn't. Through June of 2010, the United States lost 2.6 million more private sector jobs, leaving millions of Americans to ask: Where are the jobs?

The administration also promised that the stimulus would keep unemployment below 8 percent. It hasn't. Instead, unemployment reached 10 percent and remains stuck near that level today, and that ignores millions of missing unemployed left out of the official statistics.

The administration also said that the administration would create mostly private sector jobs. It didn't. Managing all that spending helped government jobs grow by 201,000 since the stimulus was passed, which has made Washington, DC, the Nation's strongest job market. Meanwhile, in the rest of the country, 47 out of 50 States have lost

jobs since the Democrats' February 2009 stimulus.

While the job situation seems to have finally stopped getting worse, things are not getting much better. The trickle of private sector job creation in 2010 is so anemic that, at the current rate, it would take until 2017 to recover the jobs lost during the recession. That's longer than it took to recover the jobs lost during the Depression of the 1930s. Another estimate finds it will take until 2021 to get unemployment back to prerecession levels. Who knew that the administration's recovery summer would last a decade or more.

The fact is the only thing the Democrat stimulus has succeeded in creating is an enormous mountain of debt which is already hurting job creation. The bill before us will only make that worse.

□ 1240

Unemployed workers want real jobs with real companies in a real economy, not 2 years of unemployment benefits. But all this Congress offers is more debt and ultimately more pink slips. It is hardly what the unemployed need.

I urge Members to oppose this bill and insist that any further spending is actually paid for. If the Speaker is right that unemployment benefits are the most stimulative thing we can do, then it will help the economy to cut other less-effective stimulus spending and use it to pay for benefits like these.

That is the sort of budgeting, if we were inclined to pass a budget, that we should have been doing all along and is the only hope for turning this economy around and actually creating jobs that all Americans want and the unemployed need most of all.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), our subcommittee chair.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when most of our Republican colleagues vote "no" against extending unemployment benefits for Americans today, these people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, they will say they are doing it out of concern for the deficit. But, in reality, they are simply trying to make the President fail at any cost.

We have precedent here for that. Back in the 1990s, when Newt Gingrich ruled this place, they thought the American people were stupid, but it didn't work then and it won't work now.

In December 1995, Newt Gingrich thought he could win the Presidency for the Republican Party by shutting down the government and proving that Bill Clinton was ineffective.

You all remember that. Instead, the American people caught on to this foolishness and overwhelmingly reelected Bill Clinton to office in 1996.

Now they have got the same play book again; they are running it again. The Republican leadership in Congress has decided that the way for the Republicans to get the White House back is by denying unemployment benefits to workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Show them that this government doesn't work. For over 6 weeks they have held displaced workers as hostages.

Now, you would think they would have learned from Gingrich back in 1995. It doesn't work. He only held the country hostage for a few days, and then he gave it up because people need to look at what the Senate Republicans are doing in the other body to see exactly what they are doing again today.

Even after the Senate broke the Republican filibuster on restoring unemployment benefits 2 days ago, the Republicans insisted on running out every minute of time left on the clock before allowing a final vote on this bill.

They wanted to dangle those workers out there for yet one more day. They wanted them to sit at home and wonder is it going to happen. How am I going to feed my kids? Can I pay for my house? For families who are without income and rely on unemployment benefits to make ends meet, every day counts.

Republicans clearly couldn't care less, and they forced these unemployed workers to twist in the wind for one more day. This is a slap in the face to millions of Americans who are struggling to find work and rely on unemployment benefits as a lifeline.

This effort to undermine the effectiveness of President Obama by denying unemployment benefits to workers, and by denying the President the power to create jobs, will ultimately fail. Republicans have done nothing more than help ensure that Mr. Obama will be elected a second time.

Good move, guys. The American people will remember and despite what the Republicans think, the voters are not stupid. They don't want the ghost of Newt Gingrich running this country, and they don't want to return to the failed economic policies of President Bush.

They know that they want this government to help people when they need help, and they know that they didn't lose their job because they did something wrong. Greed on Wall Street got them. They are suffering because of that greed which we dealt with a couple of days ago, but they need a check to pay the rent and pay for food.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, just to briefly respond to the previous speaker, we want to look forward. We don't want to look back. We don't want a cynical look to the past; we want a positive vision to the future for the American people, which means we want to go along and promote growth in the economy and do an extension of unemployment benefits in a responsible way by paying for it, eliminating wasteful spending in the stimulus package as the offset.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 15 percent of my constituents who have lost their jobs, but I also rise in support of the 85 percent who are struggling to hold onto their jobs.

Deficits do matter. Debt matters. What we have seen in the threat of default in Greece and what that did to the world economy and our own economy is similar to what we may be entering into. Given our tremendous reliance on borrowing, a similar loss of confidence in the United States would be devastating.

The administration may have its cheerleaders and spinmasters out in front telling all the cameras how swell everybody is going to be despite the work ahead; but businesses, those very entities that actually do the hiring, the innovating and the investing, aren't buying. They don't have a political motivation behind their analysis. It's simply reality as they see it. Small businesses are not confident about where this country is headed and neither are their customers.

Presidents can actually have a huge influence on consumer confidence; but every time this President gives a speech threatening American entrepreneurs, he makes things worse. As for debt, I understand the very childish playground temptation to point fingers and names and say, well, you borrowed too; but I also understand that businesses and consumers don't care about that because it doesn't fix the problem.

All we ask is that the unemployment, something we all agree on, be paid for using funds already obligated for the economic recovery. We and the American people point out—and not so subtly at times—that the way you are using the stimulus money is simply a waste of time, effort, and certainly money.

Borrowing more when it pushes us ever closer to the edge, just to continue spending money on self-serving stimulus road signs, is certainly unacceptable to them and is unacceptable to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I am sorry that the other side refuses to compromise, but that's where we are today. Americans want us to pay for this bill and not borrow another \$34 billion.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. McDERMOTT, the subcommittee chair, be allowed to control the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Chairman LEVIN, for giving me this opportunity, and again to Congressman McDERMOTT for working so hard to try to protect those people who have lost their opportunity to take care of their families because they have lost their jobs.

□ 1250

I think we're hearing too much about Republican and Democrat today. We certainly are hearing too much about oil drilling and other issues. But as we go home, as Members of Congress, I don't think people come up and say I'm a Democrat and I need help or I'm a Republican and I need help; they say I need a job. I'm willing to do anything. I'm losing my dignity and my self-esteem. My daughter was in college, and I had to tell her that she won't be able to go back. I keep ignoring my creditors' calls because I lost my job. There were so many dreams and aspirations that I had for me and my family, so many hopes that I thought in this great country I could fulfill. I thought it because I thought I was on the road to economic success. I knew I was doing better than my parents, and I had hoped so dearly that my kids would be able to say they would do better than me. Those that have finished school can't find jobs, can't afford homes. Families have consolidated, they have limited resources.

The greatest thing about this wonderful country is that you don't have to be successful if you really trust and hope that you can be successful. It's not like other countries where you're stuck where you were born and you can't aspire to do better. But we are reaching that point where Americans have lost faith in our financial centers. They've lost faith in terms of insurance health providers. God knows they've lost faith in the Congress. But when they start losing faith in themselves, that's when our country is in trouble. When they start believing that they cannot make it, that they're losing their dignity, that they're unable to put food on the table, provide shelter for their families, provide hope for their kids, America is losing something that we may not be able to recover, notwithstanding what happens from our economy.

How can people talk about deficits and pay-fors when a person is just asking for a little help? What difference does it make if we're able to take the

\$30 billion—it's not spending, it's an investment. It's an investment not in foreigners, not in protecting democracy, it's an investment in people who love and want to work. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to give them an opportunity, because in taking care of their needs, they take care of our small businesses too.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is an investment, but it is one we can pay for. And that's the sad state that we're in today because we are being refused the ability to even offer those kinds of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time. And the answer to his statement is, it's absolutely correct, this can be paid for.

I come from a State, the State of Nevada, that has 14.2 percent unemployment, and these are very, very tough times. During the rules hearing, I submitted legislation that would actually pay for this piece of legislation. We can pay for it. It's not that the majority can't pay for it, it's that they don't want to pay for it. In fact, if you take a look at November 2009, facing the Unemployment Insurance Extension bill, back then in 2009 it was fully paid for, and the administration itself came out and supported a bill that was paid for. And at the time, unemployment was higher than it is today nationwide. Don't tell me the administration doesn't think this ought to be paid for. If they wanted to pay for it at 9.8 percent, why don't they want to pay for it today?

I want to speak a little bit about the failed stimulus bill because I think some general questions were pointed my way during earlier debate, and that is whether or not the stimulus bill has actually worked. We've lost 2 million jobs in this country since the stimulus bill was passed. Forty-seven of 50 States have lost jobs since this Democratic-crafted stimulus bill. And it's no wonder that in recent polls more Americans think that Elvis is alive than this stimulus bill has worked. That's failure.

Nevada's unemployment, Clark County unemployment has gone up 40 percent. That's indisputable, and that's failure. Take Clark County alone; there are those who say the stimulus is working in Las Vegas; yet just last month almost 3,500 people filed for unemployment benefits. Take since the stimulus down in Las Vegas, nearly 40,000 people have lost their jobs in Las Vegas. Tell me the stimulus is working in Las Vegas. Take Nevada as a whole. Just last month 4,100 people filed for unemployment claims. Take the State since the stimulus: Since the stimulus, almost 50,000 people have lost their jobs in Las Vegas. Tell me that the stimulus has worked in my district. I will debate anybody on this, and I'll wait for my phone to ring.

I will just talk a little bit about the fact that in Nevada our unemployment level is 50 percent higher than the national average. If we had the national average in the State of Nevada, there would be 60,000 fewer unemployed Nevadans right now. However, there is one place in America where the stimulus has worked, and I'll give the other side credit for this, and that's Washington, D.C. Government jobs have grown by 201,000; 201,000 jobs have been created in Washington, D.C., since the stimulus was passed.

Some have alleged or believe there are no unobligated stimulus funds, and I don't agree with that. We can use unobligated stimulus funds. Go to [www.recovery.gov](http://www.recovery.gov), the administration's own Web site. Take a look at their Web site. They will show you that half of the stimulus funds at this point have not been spent. Can't we take \$34 billion of more than \$300 billion that's in unused stimulus funds to pay for this unemployment extension? That would be the right thing to do. I think that our children and grandchildren's future are worth a dime on the dollar; some apparently don't.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank Mr. McDERMOTT. I stand in full support of this emergency legislation that will restore the safety net to millions of American families. Those families have been waiting for this relief since June. Their faith in us has been tested, but today we are going to extend the help that they need.

I have spoken many times on this floor of the legendary mayor of Boston, James Michael Curley, a great orator. Curley spoke with great empathy about the forgotten man, and that's whom we're talking about today, the forgotten man and the forgotten woman, those individuals who have worked hard and played by the rules and have every reason to believe that America ought to provide them assistance in this difficult time.

He also would suggest that, in simplicity, the great ally of our civilization was a full stomach. We need to be reminded of that grim economic statistic for those who are outside the mainstream.

Let me also remind our friends here on the other side, in record time, in October of 2008, this Congress came to the aid of Wall Street. It didn't take us long to embrace the Troubled Asset Relief Program of George Bush to keep standing many of those institutions that helped create the problem that we currently find ourselves in.

There are millions of people, those who have served in Vietnam, those who have served in Afghanistan, and those who have served in Iraq and other theaters around the world, who are struggling in this economy. America is about building a community, a place where no one wants to be abandoned and no one wants to be left behind.

The great bounty of God's work has been to ensure that people in America, regardless of their political differences, have enough to eat and shelter. This opportunity to extend unemployment benefits for the American people ought to meet this moment, and I urge adoption of this measure.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what Mr. HOYER said about using the unused stimulus funds, Mr. OBEY has hailed amendments to the Supplemental Appropriations bill made on July 1 that were paid for by repeatedly cutting unspent projects in the stimulus law. And in the other body, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, has suggested the same. And that's what we're saying here. There is a better way to do this, a fiscally responsible way to not only take care of the forgotten man and woman today, but to prevent even more from being forgotten in the future.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE). Mr. SCALISE and I have worked together on American competitiveness, trying to achieve energy independence to meet our national security needs and to grow jobs.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago, the liberals running Congress passed the stimulus bill, claiming they needed to add another \$787 billion to the national debt in order to keep unemployment below 8 percent. Of course, now, a year and a half later, unemployment is approaching 10 percent.

Their first plan failed miserably, so regarding unemployment, they are coming with a plan to add another \$34 billion to the national debt that they don't want to work with us on to at least pay for by using some of that failed stimulus plan. In fact, they are still trying to defend the stimulus plan that most Americans recognize only grew the size of government and which did nothing to help stimulate the economy. The sad irony of this is that millions of American people are unemployed as a direct result of the policies of this administration.

A very real example is occurring right now in south Louisiana. Just yesterday, there was a rally in south Louisiana where over 10,000 people showed up to oppose this arbitrary and capricious ban by President Obama on drilling in the gulf.

They try to hide behind safety and pit it as safety versus jobs. In fact, the President's own safety commission he appointed after the explosion of the Deepwater Horizon said that the moratorium is a bad idea. They went on to say that this moratorium will decrease safety in the gulf. That's right. This is the moratorium that the President, himself, imposed, which is costing our State thousands of jobs and thousands more people to be on unemployment,

people who would much rather have jobs than the unemployment checks that President Obama is offering them. Their jobs have been taken away from them by the President, yet not for scientific reasons but for political reasons, because the President's own scientists say the moratorium is a bad idea and will decrease safety.

In fact, as my colleague from Louisiana pointed out, our entire delegation has been trying for 6 weeks now to meet with the President to discuss this ill-conceived idea, and he refuses to meet with us. Though, you still have hundreds of people each week being added to the unemployment rolls because of the President's policy.

What the President needs to do is actually work with us to create jobs instead of continuing to push policies that are running people onto the unemployment rolls, putting more jobs overseas and putting our country at greater risk of energy dependence. Our energy supply hasn't decreased, but now you are going to actually have more oil imported from these Middle Eastern countries that don't like us. By the way, 70 percent of all oil spills come from tankers importing oil.

Now the President has just made our country more dependent on that imported oil with the addition of his ban on drilling. That is creating more unemployment in our State. These policies are wrecking our economy.

What we need is to create jobs. Part of that means you put good policies in place that help create jobs so that people don't continue to go on the unemployment rolls because of the Obama policies. That is what we need to do is to get a different agenda. The American people are saying, Where are the jobs? All they get is more deficit spending from this administration.

They just don't get it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I can't help but respond to the change of subject from the gentleman from Louisiana.

I guess fishermen aren't worth anything. Fishermen are worthless. All that sea stuff that comes up and that they sell all over the place, they don't care about that. All they want to do is drill for oil. The President is careful and prudent and says let's look at this drilling before we go on with it because we have just proven that the oil companies are reckless. They have proven it for 79 days in the gulf, and if you can't learn from that and realize what it is doing to crabbers and to shrimp fishermen and to oystermen, then you have missed the point.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, people all over Illinois and all over America are waiting with bated breath, and they are waiting to pay utility bills, to pay house notes, to make mortgage payments, to catch up on their rent, to pay college tuition, and to buy food for their children.

They are also waiting to say, "Thank you, Nancy Pelosi." They want to say,

"Thank you, Harry Reid." They are waiting to say, "Thank you, United States Congress." They want to say, "Thank you, Barack Obama, because the action that you just took this day means to us that you are working for us. You have reinforced our confidence in our government. You have said to us that we do matter." I know that the people of Illinois will be saying, "Thank you, our government."

I urge passage.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to my friend from the State of Washington.

I would say that I would not have the audacity to speak for the people of Washington, because I haven't had the chance to actually get to know them. I can tell the gentleman that I do know the fishermen, the oystermen, the shrimpers, and those who run boats down in my State of Louisiana.

If they were here on the House floor today, they would say, "Please do not kick us when we're down. Lift this ban on drilling because, if not, it is going to kill our economy." These are the same fishermen and oystermen and shrimpers who are losing their jobs.

That's why we need sensible policies, Mr. Speaker. We are all for extending the unemployment benefit insurance, but we know we can do it in a responsible way—by paying for it with unspent stimulus money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with almost half of the unemployed out of work for more than 6 months, I am extremely disappointed that partisan bickering has delayed this important relief to American families.

I want to share with you what one of my constituents wrote to me.

He said, "I've worked all my life and supported myself and didn't ask for any special treatment. There is pride that comes from work . . . No one is more ready and willing to work than me . . . but there just isn't any."

Since the lapsing of unemployment benefits, millions have lost the benefits which are keeping their families in their homes and food on their tables, but what we and people may not know or really appreciate is that this also includes tens of thousands of former servicemembers and reservists who have returned home to find themselves without work.

How, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does prohibiting them from being able to pay their electric and grocery bills help our economy recover?

I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this extension.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his steady and undying support for people

who really have had a very tough time and who have not had any opportunities for many years now.

Thank you, Mr. McDERMOTT, for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the debate here about jobs. We, too, are asking, Where are the jobs?

From what I remember, there were very few Republican votes for the many job creation bills which Democrats have passed. So, if you are not going to support a real jobs initiative, I can't understand, for the life of me, why in the world you won't support just the basics for people, just a bit of help for those who have no jobs and for those who you won't help get jobs.

Support for unemployment compensation speaks, really, to who we are as a country. This is a moral and an ethical issue of which those who really care about the least of these should support. People have lost their jobs for a variety of reasons—primarily, yes, due to the economic policies of the previous administration. We know many people who have lost their jobs due to their not being able to find work in this new economy. People have lost their jobs because their communities have been shut down as a result of the foreclosure crisis. They have lost their homes. They have lost their jobs. They have no health care.

What in the world is going on in our country?

Some of us really get it in terms of the economic policies and what we need to do, but until we make the case in a way that Republicans get it, the least we could do is just help people pay their rent and, for those who still have mortgages, help pay their mortgages and, for those who don't have enough food, basically buy food for their kids.

We can't even get the Republicans to support a youth jobs initiative. My goodness. You know, we have over 40 percent minority youth—African American and Latino youth—who are unemployed. These young people need jobs. They need jobs not only to develop their work skills and work experience, but they have to help their families put food on the table and pay the rent.

□ 1310

So for goodness sakes, just help these people survive and weather these storms right now, because they need something to get through this. Otherwise, we're going to see a country that we all don't want to see, one that we don't recognize, one that does not care about the common good. And this is about the common good. We all have a duty and responsibility to make sure everyone at least is able to survive through these very terrible times.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who serves on the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, indeed, this is the difference between the

two parties here today. As I've listened carefully to the debate, I haven't heard anybody say we shouldn't be extending unemployment benefits.

What I have heard is that one side wants to borrow 43 cents on the dollar, mainly from the Chinese, and send the bill to our children and grandchildren. Those are my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

On this side of the aisle, we're saying, you know, all the trillions of stimulus money, the \$1.2 trillion, when you add in the interest factor, those unspent funds, maybe some of the unspent TARP funds, these programs that have helped continue to mire us in almost double-digit unemployment, maybe we could use some of those funds instead and not add to the single largest debt in America's history that's only getting worse under their watch, Mr. Speaker. That's the primary difference here today. And we must show that we are a fiscally responsible Congress today to create jobs.

Ultimately, the people in America don't want more unemployment checks. They want more paychecks. And it's the policies of this President, the policies of this Congress, brought about by the Federal takeover of health care, brought about by this huge permanent Wall Street bailout bill, where the ink is barely dry, the threatened cap-and-tax bill, and the massive debt that we're drowning in.

Under the President's own budget, we will be paying almost \$1 trillion a year in interest alone on the national debt. I mean, that's the kind of policies that our distinguished Democratic majority leader at one time likened to fiscal child abuse. And so I haven't heard that rhetoric recently, but I hope he still believes it because that's what we're engaging in.

So I do not understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to pay for this. I certainly hear the phrase "pay-as-you-go" frequently. I just don't see it practiced.

And, indeed, I do serve as one of the Republican appointees on the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission, many of whom consider that title to be an oxymoron. We will debate that later.

But the chairman, Erskine Bowles, former chief of staff, Democratic chairman, former chief of staff to President Bill Clinton, has said that our debt is a cancer that can destroy us from within. This isn't Republican verbiage. This is Democrat verbiage.

So why do the Democrats refuse to pay for this? Why do they continue to engage in what the majority leader once termed fiscal child abuse?

Again, that's where the debate is. The debate is, Are you going to pay for the unemployment insurance, or are you going to take the burden and put it on our children and grandchildren yet again? That is unconscionable, unsustainable, and it ought to be immoral.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the timeliness of my opportunity to speak is sometimes good, and I think this is one of them.

Mr. HENSARLING just spoke. I have great respect for Mr. HENSARLING. He works hard. He focuses. He's philosophically well-grounded, and he follows his philosophy. I disagree with his philosophy, his fiscal premises. And his fiscal premises that were part of the last administration's approach to the finances of this country increased our deficit by 87 percent, from \$5 trillion, essentially, a little over \$5 trillion, to a little over \$10 trillion. They didn't quite double it, but 87 percent more debt under the Bush administration.

That I called fiscal child abuse. Why? Because it was not done at a time of fiscal crisis with large unemployment. That unemployment was caused by the policies of the last administration.

Why do I say that? Because under the Clinton administration, we created 21 million jobs in the private sector, just a little short of 21 million jobs, 22.8 overall, when you include public employment.

And during the Bush administration, how did it relate to that 20.1 million new jobs in the private sector? One million. How did it relate per month to job production? 216,000 under the Clinton administration, and 11,000 per month under the Bush administrations. That's what their economic policies wrought. Their economic policies of cutting deeply, not \$40 billion or \$34 billion borrowed money, but trillions, with an "s," of borrowed money to fund tax cuts which they did not pay for.

They weren't continuations of the Tax Code, as JON KYL, the second-ranking Republican leader in the Senate, now argues ought not to be paid for; \$687 billion, that we just ought to continue that for the wealthiest in our country, not the little children who are worried about whether their parents are going to be able to afford the mortgage or afford to put bread on the table. That's what we're talking about in this bill for literally millions of people who have run out of support.

Now, will they run out of support in this moral country? They will not ultimately run out of support; they'll be put on welfare and food stamps. And they won't be available for the insurance to which their employer and they participated in, providing for the contingency that we ran the economy into the ditch, the worst economy in three-quarters of a century, wrought by the Bush economic policies, to which Mr. SESSIONS, the chairman of their campaign committee, says that they want to return to the exact agenda.

I'm so pleased I had the opportunity to come and respond to my friend from Texas. It does demonstrate the difference between our two parties. Absolutely.

JON KYL, who says, we ought to borrow \$686 billion from the Chinese to

give to the wealthiest in America, and Democrats, who say we want to borrow \$34 billion to give to the children of America whose families are in need—yes, that is the difference, if my friend from Texas wants to make that the difference.

This is about saying that we have an emergency. And historically, from Ronald Reagan to today, Ronald Reagan, Bush the first and Bush the second, what did you do when you were in charge? You borrowed at times of economic trouble to give unemployment insurance.

□ 1320

We are doing the same thing. Why did we do that? Because we perceived it to be an emergency. An emergency that people in the richest Nation on the face of the earth were about to run out of the ability to keep their homes, buy their food, clothe their children. A moral and great country thinks that's an emergency. That's what this vote is all about.

This vote is also about, as the gentleman from Texas has said, expressing our values. I agree with that. And I'm going to express my values, and I urge the Members of this House to express their values this day on this vote, as millions of people have lost their unemployment insurance because we could not get 60 votes in the Senate. Had almost every Democrat saying we need to help now. People are running out of ability to support themselves now. We paid insurance for now. So I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

A few months ago, we passed unemployment insurance through this House by unanimous consent. The election wasn't as proximate then as it is today. The deficit is way too high, and we need to get a handle on it. And I just made a speech, and I have been criticized by some on my side of the aisle and some others for saying that we needed to put everything on the table. I reiterate that today. We need to put everything on the table. No sacred cows.

I have three children, three grandchildren, as all of you will get tired of hearing, and one great granddaughter. And I owe it to her personally, as a Member of this House, to say ladies and gentlemen of this House and of our country, we have a moral responsibility to get a handle on this deficit.

A reporter just asked me as I was walking down the aisle, did I agree with Mr. Bernanke's comment that we ought to pay if we extended the tax cuts? And I said to him this: At a time of fiscal crisis, when our economy is struggling to get back from the ditch it was in when this administration took over—how much of a ditch? During the last year of the Clinton administration, we added 1.9 million new jobs, I tell my friend from Texas. Last year, Clinton administration, 1.9 million new jobs in America. And it was a slowdown period.

During the last year of the Bush administration, after the economic policies that were pursued from 2001 and 2002 and 2003 and through 2009, even though we took the Congress we couldn't do anything because the President would veto legislation, and did in fact veto legislation, 3.8 million Americans lost their jobs. That's a difference of 1.9 million new jobs in the last year of Clinton to 3.8 million lost jobs in the last year of Bush, or a 5.7 million jobs turnaround. Is there any wonder why there is a lot of pain in America and families are in great distress and they're angry and they have angst? And we share that.

Today does not solve the problem. But today reaches out to those folks in distress and say in the short-term, on an emergency basis we are going to continue to give you help so you can support your families in this, the wealthiest Nation on the face of the earth. You worked hard. You paid in. And through no fault of your own, you lost your job.

Maybe because of the fault of Wall Street that my friend believes we were too harsh on, we are imposing rules on so they can play by the rules and not squander and take risks that put Wall Street profits before Main Street stability. Yes, and also we're not going to apologize to the BP oil company and say we're sorry that we expect you to be accountable for the negligence that caused millions of people to be in economic distress. We're not going to say sorry. Some people want to say sorry that the President of the United States suggested, hey, you need to help those people.

Maybe helping people is a difference between our two parties. I don't necessarily think that. I don't want to say that. But if that's the difference, today is a day when 435 of us can stand up and vote "aye" to help millions of Americans in deep distress through no fault of their own.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and let people know that you are on their side.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friend, the distinguished majority leader of the House, that in the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, there was a great bipartisan effort that led to those balanced budgets because there was a Republican majority.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. BOUSTANY. I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. It's a good point. I ask my friend—that is true—why couldn't you do it when you had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency?

Mr. BOUSTANY. I will reclaim my time, and I will remind the majority leader that we have the opportunity to go forward now and not cast blame on the past. So I would say that President Obama actually got it right in a statement of administration policy on November 2009 regarding unemployment benefit extensions, which was fully

paid for. And here is what he said. I quote, "Fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs. The administration therefore supports the fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits embodied in the bill."

All we're saying is there is a better way to do this, and that is to pay for this extension.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for giving me a moment to speak.

Mr. Speaker, my friends from the party opposite refer to deficit and debts. Well, you know, debts are important. The deficit is important. The national debt, all these things are critical. But I guess my question is, you know, when the Republican Caucus voted to give the most wealthy and most privileged members of American society a \$700 billion-plus tax cut that they didn't pay for, they weren't that concerned about fiscal responsibility. Why no fiscal responsibility for the two wars? Ten billion dollars a month for Iraq, no fiscal responsibility for that. When the prescription drug handout was given to Big Pharma, \$400 billion, no fiscal responsibility then.

But when the poor, hardworking people of America find themselves without work and come and say, you know what, still looking for work, haven't found one, and need some help from my fellow Americans, it's like, "No, no, no, no. We cannot help you because we got to worry about the deficit." Why so much concern, so much heartfelt angst about what the wealthiest, most privileged Americans need but nothing but a cold heart and a closed purse for people who are in an emergency situation?

Mr. Speaker, I ask what about the debts of the people who are unemployed? What about them having to go to family and borrow money? What about them being captured by the payday lenders and the rent-to-owners and these kind of people, folks who take advantage of poor people when they don't have any money and they don't have any unemployment insurance benefits? What about their personal debt? The American people should respond.

I don't want to say that the party opposite is heartless, but this looks heartless. It looks that way. And I don't want my friends in the party opposite to look like they just don't care about poor people. So I urge everyone in this caucus to support and vote for this measure. It is important, it is the right time.

I will just say, finally, the fact is that for every dollar spent on unemployment benefits, \$1.60 goes into the economy, which means we begin to pull ourselves out of this situation and deal with this deficit.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the kind chairman, Mr. MCDERMOTT, for yielding me the 2 minutes.

Sometimes when they say gentlewoman, I don't feel so gentle on the subject of unemployment. And in fact, I rise in strong support of this bill, which is long overdue because of the delays in the other Chamber. And I want to thank Chairman MCDERMOTT for his extraordinary leadership and our Speaker for bringing this bill forward.

All the economic studies show that in fact direct consumer spending that results from the expenditure of unemployment checks on basics—paying for food, paying your mortgage so you don't lose your home, making your car payment on that old jalopy you use to go to work—that, in fact, this creates the largest bang inside our economy to move it up than any investment we can make other than in infrastructure investment, where we are employing people building bridges, building roads, some of the things that people on the other side of the aisle are making fun of.

It's no fun to go over a bridge that collapses. We saw that in Minnesota. These are issues that in a great Nation you take care of. In Ohio, we need unemployment compensation right now. We're one of the platforms that manufactures and grows jobs immediately to hold this country up. And our people, 100,000 of them, still remain out of work and utterly dependent on these benefits. They will be affected directly by the extension of these benefits. Indeed, Ohio has a total of between 600,000 and a million people who are unemployed, working in part-time jobs, or they have fallen out of the workforce through no fault of their own.

The Obama administration will have created more jobs by the end of August than the Bush administration did in the whole 8 years that it sat in office and did nothing except create more war and more unemployment and more outsourcing of jobs. I find my colleagues on the other side of the aisle out of touch—I can't even explain them. We don't live in the same world.

I respect people who go to work every day. I respect those who get injured on the job. I respect those farmers who are out in the fields right now harvesting crops. I respect those who work for them. I respect the people who work in our auto plants. I respect the people working in hundred-degree weather up on bridges around my district right now trying to fix things up and hold things together until a better day comes.

So the least we can do is return to them the money they already paid in, that their employers already paid in, that they already earned. They earned it. I say to the gentleman I support this bill a thousand percent. Ohioans are waiting for their unemployment checks. But most of all, they want to go back to work.

□ 1330

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak yet again on this subject, but to hear the last three speakers, clearly there appears to be a confusion on the other side of the aisle between unemployment checks and paychecks.

I mean, what we've heard the Speaker say—I wish I had her exact quote in front of me—that essentially by putting out more unemployment checks, that this is one of the best ways to create paychecks. I've never heard such circular logic in my life.

Now, clearly we need an extension of unemployment. I mean, I must admit I find it somewhat ironic that the President of the United States brings up three unemployed workers. To the best of my knowledge, they've been unemployed during his Presidency. What a testament to his policies and the policies of this institution.

Again, between a national takeover of our health care where employees don't know how much their health care costs are going to be. They're not creating new jobs. Threatened cap-and-trade. Nobody knows what their energy costs are going to be. No new job creation.

We have this financial regulatory bill. Nobody knows what the cost of capital is going to be, particularly with a bureau that has the ability to ban and ration credit for small businesses. You've got private business sitting on almost \$2 trillion that could be employed for paychecks but instead, once again, due to the policies of my friends on the other side of the aisle, we're having that debate on unemployment checks instead.

And let me make sure that people aren't drowning on all of this straw that's in the House Chamber today from all the straw men. Here's the debate. In the words of the Democratic majority leader, Are we going to engage in fiscal child abuse and borrow the money principally from the Chinese to pay for this, or are we not? That's the question. That is the only question before the House right now. Are we going to borrow the money from our children and grandchildren, send them the bill, or are we going to pay for it today and quit using it on failed stimulus plans? That's the debate. The American people are not confused. And again, they want paychecks, not unemployment checks.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is about whether we're going to pay for this or not. Consider that this is the eighth time this Congress is going to extend these benefits. The eighth time. That's an indication that the current economic policy of this administration and this Congress is a failure.

I mentioned earlier the fact of the matter is we have a choice. We can do this in a fiscally responsible way, or we can choose to run up additional debt on our children and grandchildren to the tune of \$34 billion between now and November.

Again, I think the President, President Obama, got it right in the statement of administration policy in November 2009 when the unemployment benefit extension was actually paid for. Again, I'm going to quote what he said: "Fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term of the economy and the creation of jobs. The administration therefore supports the fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits embodied in the bill."

Now, if fiscal responsibility helps the economy and job creation, then the fiscal irresponsibility of this bill before us will hurt the economy and job creation.

And I think the American people have spoken. They want us to do this, but they want us to pay for it. Let's do the right thing and actually pay for the spending we approve and help our economy grow, help job creation. As the administration said, a fiscally responsible approach is what's needed.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate and finally put this on the back burner until November when we have to come back and look at it again perhaps—we'll see—one of the speakers on the other side talked about confusion. My view is that the confusion here is between whether we're going to send unemployment checks or we're going to tell people, Go hungry. That's the confusion.

People say, Well, it's about paying for it. I will remind my colleagues on the other side Mr. Bush was President for 8 years, and when we did unemployment, we did it on an emergency basis. We never paid for it one time and you guys, the Republicans—I'm not supposed to address them directly—they didn't pay for it, Mr. Speaker. They were in charge and their President was in charge, but they called it an emergency.

Now under Mr. Obama, it's not an emergency.

Suddenly we're going to tie up people's minds and try and confuse them. But the fact is that for 6 weeks we have said to workers in this country, We are not going to extend benefits.

Now, we have never, in the history of this country, when unemployment was at 7.2 or above, failed to extend benefits until the Republicans got a serious case of fiscal—well, I'm not going to say exactly what I think—but fiscal disease has overtaken their mind. And they've suddenly caught this thing—it must be in the air around here or somewhere down around the Ohio River between Cincinnati and Kentucky. They've got leadership that said, You know, we can infect everybody with this fiscal fear. We'll just sacrifice a

few million. It's only 2½ million people who are going to lose their benefits. So it's not very many. There's 300 million in America. We can throw away 2½ million. That's easy. They won't vote. They're too stupid to know who's doing it to them.

That's the kind of message you're sending when you're saying you won't give unemployment benefits.

This is so easily understood by the American people. This is not climate change. This is not all the complicated stuff. Some people around here think the American people have a very short memory span, but they don't on stuff where it's right down to the bone.

And you will remember this day as the day when finally the Republicans came to their senses. They finally said, You know, this ain't going to work. It really ain't going to work. We're not going to admit it. We're going to say we were doing it on principle.

But there is no principle at the table when the mother opens the cupboard and there is nothing in it. Or when the lights aren't turned on because you haven't paid the utility bills. Or when the water is turned off because you haven't paid your water bill. What does a mother say the principle is? Now kids, get in the bathtub, but there is no water. Clean yourself up, right?

What kind of nonsense is this? Do you think this money is going for people to buy iPads or iPhones or i4Phones or whatever? This is going for the necessities of life. And you're saying to the ordinary people of this country, Well, we have a principle, under the Democrats, we have to pay for it. Now not under the Democrats.

And I can hardly wait until we get the proposals over from the Senate to extend the tax breaks and watch you guys do a double flip. You will get a "10" in Olympic terms for your ability to do a double flip and say, Well, now we don't have to pay for it. And watch, they're going to send over the estate tax. They are going to send over a bailout for the people at the very top. And you're going to say, We don't have to pay for them. Oh, no. No, no. They're very rich. No, no, no, no, no, we can't pay for that. No, no. But they're going to make us pay for the people who are in the most dire distress in this society.

It's really shameful, and I'm going to watch with pleasure as you vote "no" as you vote yourself out of here.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly, resolutely, and steadfastly support this bill to extend critical unemployment benefits for our citizens through the end of November. This bill will provide vital assistance to over 137,600 Illinoisans, and to the 2.5 million Americans, who lost their benefits between June 2nd and July 17th. This bill helps ad-

dress a national emergency resulting from one of the worst economic recessions in our country's history.

Unemployment insurance is not a theoretical concept to these citizens. Unemployment is a very real lifeline. It allows mothers and fathers to buy food for their children. It allows people to help keep a roof over their families' heads. I have received so many tearful calls from my constituents who call to beg for my help. They are disheartened by their continued unemployment despite active and prolonged efforts to find a job. They are embarrassed that they cannot support their families, and they are frightened that their children will suffer from their inability to feed, clothe, or provide housing. When they learn that their government allowed these lifeline benefits to expire and failed to reinstate them for almost 8 weeks, they are shocked. They worked and paid taxes for years with an understanding that government would help them in a time of need. Yet, this assistance was not there.

I think it is unfortunate that Republicans have delayed this critical financial assistance for so long. To add insult to injury, while proclaiming that our government could not afford \$33 billion to help our citizens who are suffering during an economic emergency, the Republican leadership confidently asserted the position that we want the government to spend \$650 billion for tax cuts for the wealthy. This is approximately 20 times the cost of this critical unemployment assistance. This is the same leadership that had no difficulty spending a trillion dollars for two wars and giving tax breaks to the wealthiest of the wealthy.

The extension of the aid for 99 weeks is an important first step in helping our citizens who are struggling to find employment. I promise to continue to work with the Democratic leadership to push for ways to help those remain unemployed beyond the 99 weeks. Long-term unemployment is an unfortunate reality for Chicago and for my constituents.

Passing this bill today tells our citizens that we are working for them. Further, passing this bill today reinforces their confidence in their government—confidence that they will help care for them in the lean times. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010, which will extend unemployment benefits to millions of Americans that are in dire need of support. Without this legislation these families will lose the only lifeline that they can count on in this historic economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that this bill is finally close to the President's desk, I deeply regret the weeks of partisan politics by Republicans, especially those in the Senate, which have obstructed this legislation and delayed benefits to struggling families across the country. Since Republicans allowed benefits to begin expiring in May, over 250 million individuals nationwide and 429,000 in California have lost benefits that help them feed their families, pay their bills, and sleep with a roof over their heads.

Republicans claim to oppose these benefits because of their cost. But, let us not forget that Republicans never bothered to find offsets for the Bush tax cuts. They never felt the need to pay for the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Only

when unemployment benefits are on the table do Republicans suddenly discover an interest in fiscal responsibility. Republicans want to withhold relief from millions of Americans who, through no fault of their own, have lost their jobs in this economic crisis. But this vote offers a final opportunity to put partisan politics aside and work together for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has taken bold action to energize the economy during this historic economic crisis and lay the groundwork for long-term, stable growth. To be sure, these actions are working: to date, the Recovery Act alone has saved or created over 682,000 jobs nationwide. However, rebuilding our economy takes time and, despite the success of Democrats' job-creating legislation, many individuals and families across the country still need our help. We cannot abandon the families that have been left jobless because of the previous Administration's economic mismanagement. This important measure will retroactively extend unemployment assistance to individuals whose benefits started to phase out in May and will guarantee that benefits are available through November.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. This is an American issue. Millions of Americans need our help and this is our opportunity to provide it. Let us help the people all across the country who have been hit hard by this recession, people who, through no fault of their own, are struggling to stay in their homes and feed their kids.

Moreover, in addition to providing relief to those in need, this bill is an important step in our economic rebuilding process. Unemployment benefits create economic demand that stimulates the economy and puts people back to work. This is a fast-acting and cost-effective way to energize the economy: every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits leads to \$1.90 in economic activity. This bill responds to both our immediate obligation to help the American people in a time of great need and the long-term goal of consistent growth and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an obvious "aye" vote. The resistance it has seen in the past few weeks is shocking. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4213.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. This legislation will extend unemployment insurance (UI) benefits, which expired seven long weeks ago, to millions of Americans families who rely on this assistance to make ends meet during these difficult economic times.

I regret that due to Republican objections, delays and stalling tactics, Unemployment Compensation was allowed to lapse for so long. My colleagues in the House of Representatives and I have already passed this legislation three times since May. Unfortunately, the bill was allowed to languish in the Senate while millions of Americans were forced to do without this critical lifeline.

With unemployment in Los Angeles County hovering at 12.2 percent, I continue to hear from my constituents how important these benefits are to them as they look for new employment during these difficult economic times.

One constituent, a college graduate who lives in Los Angeles, wrote to inform me that he has been searching for a job for 18 months without success. He has long since run out of savings and without unemployment benefits

cannot pay his rent. Another constituent, a mother of three children, was recently laid off and is relying on unemployment benefits to pay her mortgage payments and keep a roof over her family's head.

It is for hardworking Americans like these, making good faith efforts to secure employment and trying desperately to find some stability in these uncertain times, that I vote for this important measure.

While we act today to protect the unemployed and their families, I believe we must redouble our efforts to create job opportunities and get Americans back to work.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4213, the "Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010." After weeks of needless delay, this legislation will ensure that the estimated \$2.5 million Americans who lost their coverage will again have access to the lifeline provided by unemployment insurance and again be able to pay their bills and put food on their table. During this unfortunate period, my friends on the other side of the aisle have repeatedly told out of work Americans that the human dignity they seek is a luxury we cannot afford. Let me be clear: There is nothing luxurious about barely getting by—having to decide between your mortgage, your health, or your family's well being.

The opposition to this legislation has been disingenuous, cruel and out of touch. Many of the unemployed people in my district spent years working hard, paying their bills, and contributing to their communities. Through no fault of their own, they found themselves out of work.

Beyond voting for this bill, my Republican friends ought to take responsibility for their role in precipitating this economic disaster. It was they who pushed policies that promoted unfettered free trade, tax cuts for the rich, and the casino culture on Wall Street. The least they could do is vote with the Majority to minimize some of the pain they caused.

For the sake of human decency for our fellow citizens, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago we were here talking about this. Two months ago we were here talking about this. And even if this bill becomes law, in four months we will likely be back again talking about this. The specific subject is extended unemployment benefits.

But the real issue, and what is driving the need for a record 99 weeks of unemployment benefits, is this Administration's woeful record when it comes to creating jobs that provide paychecks, instead of unemployment checks.

In February 2009, the President signed into law the Democrats' trillion-dollar "stimulus" plan. That was the plan Democrats promised would create 3.7 million jobs, keep unemployment under 8 percent, and stimulate strong private sector job growth.

None of that happened.

Instead, over 2 million more jobs were lost and unemployment spiked to 10 percent, though the number of government jobs has grown somewhat.

So here we are again—extending unemployment benefits because stimulus failed to create the millions of jobs Democrats promised.

But instead of doing this responsibly, this bill will simply add another \$34 billion to our \$13 trillion mountain of debt.

We can do better than this.

Both Republicans and Democrats support helping the long-term unemployed. And both Republicans and Democrats want to responsibly pay for these benefits.

That would be far better than adding to the unchecked growth in our debt that is already costing us jobs, and that threatens to overwhelm our economy in debt and higher taxes for decades to come.

The fact is, we can both provide this help and pay for it by cutting less effective stimulus spending.

The last time we debated unemployment benefits, I offered a motion to pay for that spending. That is what the Heller substitute to this bill would have done if it was made in order today. Even the Democrat Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, has also proposed cutting stimulus to pay for certain extenders.

The American people know it isn't right to add these costs to our already overdrawn national credit card. They want to help those in need. But they also know someone has to pay when government spends money. That assistance must not put our fiscal house as a Nation in even worse shape—and we are already in terrible shape.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this bill today and instead work together to quickly pass a bill to extend Federal unemployment benefits while responsibly paying for it.

That is what we should have been doing all along, which would have prevented the lapse in benefits millions have already experienced. Democrat Leaders rejected that obvious compromise, leading to needless additional suffering in recent weeks by millions of unemployed workers who want a job. But it is not too late to fix this, and to do so responsibly, so that we do right by the unemployed, as well as future generations.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the over 150,000 residents in the State of Texas who have lost their unemployment benefits since June 2nd. Nationally, over 2.5 million Americans have lost their eligibility for unemployment insurance, at a time when our country is suffering through the most difficult economic slump it has witnessed since the Great Depression.

Unemployment insurance helps our country in two crucial ways:

First, unemployment insurance assists those hurt most by this recession.

Second, unemployment insurance is a major job creator.

Nearly 15 million Americans are out of work. Of these 15 million, 46 percent have been out of work for more than six months. In recent months, there have been at least five unemployed workers for every job opening.

These are proud, working Americans who have already been victimized by the state of our Nation's economy. Why are we victimizing them again by denying them this crucial lifeline?

Unemployment insurance is also one of the most stimulative measures the Federal Government can take to help the economy. The Congressional Budget Office has found that for every dollar spent on unemployment benefits, \$1.90 of economic growth is generated.

In a recent study by the non-partisan Economic Policy Institute, the expansion of unemployment benefits since 2007 has supported

1.7 million full-time equivalent positions. These jobs have raised GDP by \$244.8 billion, a 1.7 percent boost.

In sharp contrast to extending tax cuts for the wealthiest in our country, unemployed Americans will spend their benefits immediately to pay their rent, buy groceries and other necessary goods, thereby creating jobs throughout the economy.

This is not simply smart policy. This is a moral issue. We will be helping our friends and neighbors during their time of need.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a huge relief for millions of Americans who remain out of work through no fault of their own that the Senate has overcome the Republican filibuster to extend unemployment insurance benefits.

It is an insult to the American people to suggest that those who are unemployed are sitting back and not looking for work while taking unemployment compensation. In fact, in order to qualify for unemployment benefits, one must be diligently looking for a job. Extending these benefits is not only the right thing to do for these families, but it is also important for our economic recovery. If these individuals and families are unable to purchase groceries or pay their rent or mortgages, then the entire community suffers.

Washington Republicans say they are opposed to these emergency benefits because they claim to be concerned about the deficit. However, they recently announced that they wanted to extend the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and add over \$700 billion to the deficit—a sum that would be paid by our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation so that we can continue to help American families make ends meet during these difficult economic times.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Act of 2010. This legislation extends unemployment benefits to millions of Americans in need through November and retroactively restores benefits to those that recently lost theirs due to Congressional inaction. Unemployment in Ohio is at 10.5 percent. It is the number one request when I talk to my constituents at home.

Even with passage of this important legislation, many of my constituents in the greater Cleveland area will continue to suffer. Many will be ineligible for the benefits provided by this bill because they have exhausted the emergency temporary assistance granted by Congress. Still others are at a greater disadvantage than most; according to the latest unemployment statistics from the Department of Labor, members of the African-American and Latino communities continue to experience disproportionately high long-term unemployment rates at 15.4 percent and 12.4 percent, respectively. While Congress endeavors to provide direct help to those needing it the most, we must also focus on creating jobs.

Our domestic manufacturing sector has been decimated under the weight of the economy, bad trade agreements like NAFTA and CAFTA, and policy neglect. We cannot have a strong American economy without a strong industrial manufacturing sector. We need a coordinated Federal policy that puts the manufacturing sector back in its rightful place as an

engine of the American economy. In recognition of that need, I authored H. Res. 444, which says that the steel, automotive, aerospace and shipping industries are vital to America's national and economic security.

Extending unemployment benefits alone will not address the needs of all Americans currently looking for work across various employment sectors, but it can serve to shore up our local communities and our economy. I urge passage of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Act of 2010.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4213, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010.

Unemployment levels are high across the country, and in my state of Illinois unemployment has remained well above 10 percent for over a year. Millions of Americans are actively looking for work, and for these families, unemployment insurance (UI) is a necessary to assist with their medical bills, mortgages, and basic needs so they can continue looking for employment every week.

While I share the concerns of my colleagues regarding spending that is not paid for, canceling these benefits now will only hurt these families and our economy. We have a responsibility to support people out of work and in great need. Moving forward, we may not be able to provide as much assistance to people and the states as many would like, and we may not in the short-term be able to fully offset the cost of all Federal spending. But working together, we can continue to chart a course that builds on our economic recovery and helps those in great need while beginning to address long-term economic challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1550, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5341, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 152, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—272

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Adler (NJ)	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Altmire	Bocchieri	Carney
Andrews	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Arcuri	Boren	Castle
Baca	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Boucher	Chandler
Barrow	Boyd	Childers
Bean	Brady (PA)	Chu
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Clay
Berman	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bilbray	Cao	Clyburn
Bilirakis	Capito	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Connolly (VA)

Conyers	Kanjorski	Posey	Granger	Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg
Costa	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Graves (GA)	E.	Roe (TN)
Costello	Kennedy	Quigley	Graves (MO)	Mack	Rogers (AL)
Courtney	Kildee	Rahall	Griffith	Marchant	Rogers (KY)
Critz	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel	Guthrie	Markey (CO)	Rohrabacher
Crowley	Kilroy	Reichert	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Rooney
Cuellar	Kind	Reyes	Harper	McCaul	Rosckam
Cummings	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Richardson	Hastings (WA)	McClintock	Royce
Dahlkemper	Kissell	Rodriguez	Hensarling	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Herger	McIntyre	Scalise
Davis (CA)	Kosmas	Ros-Lehtinen	Hill	McKeon	Schmidt
Davis (IL)	Kratovil	Ross	Hunter	McMorris	Schock
Davis (TN)	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)	Inglis	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Issa	Mica	Sessions
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger	Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Rush	Johnson, Sam	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
DeLauro	LaTourette	Ryan (OH)	Jordan (OH)	Miller, Gary	Shuler
Dent	Lee (CA)	Salazar	King (IA)	Minnick	Shuster
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Linda	Kingston	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (GA)	T.	Kirk	Myrick	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta	Kline (MN)	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Dicks	LoBiondo	Sarbanes	Nunes	Nye	Stearns
Dingell	Loeb sack	Schakowsky	Lamborn	Olson	Sullivan
Doggett	Loftgren, Zoe	Schauer	Lance	Paul	Terry
Donnelly (IN)	Lowe y	Schiff	Latham	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Driehaus	Lujan	Schrader	Lee (NY)	Paulsen	Thornberry
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Schwartz	Lewis (CA)	Pence	Tiberi
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Scott (GA)	Linder	Pitts	Walden
Ehlers	Maloney	Scott (VA)	Lucas	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Ellison	Manullo	Serrano	Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Ellsworth	Markey (MA)	Sestak	Lummis	Putnam	Wittman
Engel	Marshall	Shea-Porter	Capuano	Radanovich	Wolf
Eshoo	Matheson	Sherman	Doyle	Hodes	Ortiz
Etheridge	Matsui	Sires	Fallin	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton	Fallin	King (NY)	Wamp
Fattah	McCollum	Slaughter			
Filner	McCotter	Smith (NJ)			
Foster	McDermott	Smith (WA)			
Frank (MA)	McGovern	Snyder			
Fudge	McMahon	Space			
Garamendi	McNerney	Speier			
Gerlach	Meek (FL)	Spratt			
Giffords	Mee ks (NY)	Stark			
Gonzalez	Melancon	Stupak			
Gordon (TN)	Michaud	Sutton			
Grayson	Miller (NC)	Tanner			
Green, Al	Miller, George	Taylor			
Green, Gene	Mitchell	Teague			
Grijalva	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)			
Gutierrez	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)			
Hall (NY)	Moore (WI)	Tierney			
Halvorson	Moran (VA)	Titus			
Hare	Murphy (CT)	Tonko			
Harman	Murphy (NY)	Towns			
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Tsongas			
Heinrich	Murphy, Tim	Turner			
Heller	Nadler (NY)	Upton			
Herseth Sandlin	Napolitano	Van Hollen			
Higgins	Neal (MA)	Velázquez			
Himes	Oberstar	Visclosky			
Hinche y	Obey	Walz			
Hinojosa	Oliver	Wasserman			
Hirono	Owens	Schultz			
Holden	Pallone	Waters			
Holt	Pascrell	Watson			
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Watt			
Hoyer	Payne	Waxman			
Inslee	Pelosi	Weiner			
Israel	Perlmutter	Welch			
Jackson (IL)	Perriello	Whitfield			
Jackson Lee	Peters	Wilson (OH)			
(TX)	Peterson	Woolsey			
Johnson (GA)	Petri	Wu			
Johnson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth			
Johnson, E. B.	Platts	Young (AK)			
Jones	Polis (CO)	Young (FL)			
Kagen	Pomeroy				

NAYS—152

Aderholt	Bright	Cooper
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Austria	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Ginny	Djou
Bachus	Buchanan	Dreier
Baird	Burgess	Duncan
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Emerson
Bartlett	Buyer	Flake
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Fleming
Berry	Camp	Forbes
Biggart	Campbell	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Fox
Blackburn	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Chaffetz	Gallely
Bonner	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Boozman	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Cole	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Goodlatte

Granger	Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg
Graves (GA)	E.	Roe (TN)
Graves (MO)	Mack	Rogers (AL)
Griffith	Marchant	Rogers (KY)
Guthrie	Markey (CO)	Rohrabacher
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Rooney
Harper	McCaul	Rosc kam
Hastings (WA)	McClintock	Royce
Hensarling	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Herger	McIntyre	Scalise
Hill	McKeon	Schmidt
Hunter	McMorris	Schock
Inglis	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Mica	Sessions
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Jordan (OH)	Miller, Gary	Shuler
King (IA)	Minnick	Shuster
Kingston	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Kirk	Myrick	Smith (NE)
Kline (MN)	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Nunes	Nye	Stearns
Lamborn	Olson	Sullivan
Lance	Paul	Terry
Latham	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NY)	Paulsen	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Tiberi
Linder	Pitts	Walden
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Lummis	Putnam	Wittman
	Radanovich	Wolf

NOT VOTING—9

Capuano	Hodes	Ortiz
Doyle	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Fallin	King (NY)	Wamp

□ 1413

Messrs. CARTER, BROWN of South Carolina, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUPAK). Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

#### JOYCE ROGERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5341) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, as the "Joyce Rogers Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.